

## REMARKS

Claims 1-59 are pending. Claims 1-59 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments.

### 103 Rejections

#### Claims 1-23

The instant Office Actions states that Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldszmidt et al. ("Goldszmidt," U.S. Patent No. 6,195,680) in view of Odamura (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,248). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-23 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Goldszmidt and Odamura, alone or in combination.

Independent Claims 1, 10 and 19 each recite the following limitation: "said media data comprising an item of content encoded into a first multiple description bitstream and into a second multiple description bitstream, wherein said first multiple description bitstream and said second multiple description bitstream are decodable independent of one another." Thus, as recited in the claims, an item of media data is encoded into multiple, separate bitstreams, where the separate bitstreams have the property that they are decodable independently of one another. Applicants respectfully submit that Goldszmidt does not show or suggest media data that is encoded as recited in the independent Claims 1, 10 and 19. Applicants also respectfully submit that Goldszmidt does not show or suggest media data so encoded being streamed in the manner recited by independent Claims 1, 10 and 19.

Applicants also respectfully submit that Odamura does not overcome the shortcomings of Goldszmidt. That is, Applicants respectfully submit that Odamura, alone or in combination with Goldszmidt, does not show or suggest media data that is encoded as recited in independent Claims 1, 10 and 19, nor does Odamura, alone or in combination with Goldszmidt, show or suggest media data so encoded being streamed in the manner recited by independent Claims 1, 10 and 19.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that Goldszmidt and Odamura, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the embodiments of the present claimed invention recited in independent Claims 1, 10 and 19, and that these claims are considered patentable over Goldszmidt and Odamura (alone or in combination). Because Claims 2-8, 11-18 and 20-23 depend from either Claim 1, 10 or 19 and contain additional limitations, these claims are also considered patentable over Goldszmidt and Odamura (alone or in combination). Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting Claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

#### Claims 24-41

The instant Office Actions states that Claims 24-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldszmidt in view of La Porta et al. ("La Porta;" U.S. Patent No. 6,654,359). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 24-41 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Goldszmidt and La Porta, alone or in combination.

Independent Claims 24, 33, 34 and 41 each recite the following limitation: "said media data comprising an item of content encoded into a first multiple description bitstream and into a second multiple description

bitstream, wherein said first multiple description bitstream and said second multiple description bitstream are decodable independent of one another.” As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Goldszmidt does not show or suggest media data that is encoded as recited in independent Claims 24, 33, 34 and 41, nor does Goldszmidt does show or suggest media data so encoded being streamed in the manner recited by independent Claims 24, 33, 34 and 41.

Applicants also respectfully submit that La Porta does not overcome the shortcomings of Goldszmidt. That is, Applicants respectfully submit that La Porta, alone or in combination with Goldszmidt, does not show or suggest media data that is encoded as recited in independent Claims 24, 33, 34 and 41, nor does La Porta, alone or in combination with Goldszmidt, show or suggest media data so encoded being streamed in the manner recited by independent Claims 24, 33, 34 and 41.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that Goldszmidt and La Porta, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the embodiments of the present claimed invention recited in independent Claims 24, 33, 34 and 41, and that these claims are considered patentable over Goldszmidt and La Porta (alone or in combination). Because Claims 25-32 and 35-40 depend from either Claim 24 or 34 and contain additional limitations, these claims are also considered patentable over Goldszmidt and La Porta (alone or in combination). Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting Claims 24-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

#### 102 Rejections

The instant Office Actions states that Claims 42-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Goldszmidt. The

Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 42-59 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Goldszmidt.

Independent Claims 42 and 51 each recite the following limitation: “said media data comprising an item of content encoded into a first multiple description bitstream and into a second multiple description bitstream, wherein said first multiple description bitstream and said second multiple description bitstream are decodable independent of one another.” As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Goldszmidt does not show or suggest media data that is encoded as recited in independent Claims 42 and 51, nor does Goldszmidt does show or suggest media data that is so encoded being streamed in the manner recited by independent Claims 42 and 51.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Goldszmidt does not show or suggest the embodiments of the present claimed invention recited in independent Claims 42 and 51, and that these claims are considered patentable over Goldszmidt. Because Claims 43-50 and 52-59 depend from either Claim 42 or 51 and contain additional limitations, these claims are also considered patentable over Goldszmidt. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting Claims 42-59 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is traversed.

### Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-59 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.


Applicants have reviewed the references cited but not relied upon. Applicants did not find these references to show or suggest the present claimed invention: U.S. Patent Nos. 6,243,367; 6,640,248 and 6,675,208.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 2/7/05

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John P. Wagner, Jr.  
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060